

REMARKS

Counsel thanks Examiner Amini for the courtesy of an Interview held on November 8, 2005.

The foregoing amendments to independent claim 1 have been discussed at the Interview and the feature of “a means for supplying data of said blending ratio to be presented to a user” has been indicated by Examiner Amini to define over the art. The highlighted feature has previously been presented in claims 11, 12 as well as claim 26, now cancelled, and is therefore believed to raise no new issues and require no further search. Entry of this Amendment is deemed in order.

Claims 1-4 and 6-25 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of claim 26 as detailed above. Claim 26 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Dependency of claims 4 and 15 has been corrected to avoid potential indefiniteness issues. Independent claims 1, 11 and 12 have been amended to improve claim language and avoid the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The Examiner’s response to Applicants’ arguments is believed moot in view of the foregoing amendments as well as the remarks advanced herein below which have also been discussed at the Interview.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, *second paragraph* rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-26 is believed overcome in view of the above amendments. In particular, “the identified color chip” has been removed from independent claims 1, 11 and 12, and replaced with --the selected color chip-- which finds antecedent basis at the newly added feature of --a color chip selected by a user--.

In response to the Examiner’s question how the claimed invention works when the user has a color blind problem, an explanation has been given at the Interview, i.e., the user’s colorblindness is irrelevant to the claimed invention at least because the claimed invention always works for that

particular user. In addition, *35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph* requires definite scope and clarity of a claim. Since the scope of each of independent claims 1, 11 and 12 is clear and ascertainable to a person of ordinary skill in the art, the claims are not indefinite within the meaning of *35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph*.

Withdrawal of the *35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph* rejection is now believed appropriate and therefore respectfully requested.

The *35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph* rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-26 is believed overcome in view of the above amendments, i.e., “identified” has been removed from independent claims 1, 11 and 12.

The *35 U.S.C. 103(a)* rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-26 is believed overcome in view of the above amendments and the following remarks which have been presented at the Interview.

In particular, Applicants note that none of the applied references teach or suggest the claimed “means for supplying data of said blending ratio to be presented to a user” as recited in independent claim 1, and “supplying data of said blending ratio to be presented to a user” as recited in independent claims 11 and 12. The applied references are all directed to conversion of one color space to another. As such, every color in the initial color space is correlated with a corresponding target color in the target color space. The target color will then be displayed, printed or otherwise outputted. However, the blending ratio of the colorants in the target color is not displayed, printed or otherwise presented to the user. Instead, all the user is presented with is merely the target color, without any information on the ratio with which the colorants are blended to obtain the target color. Thus, if the user wants to know how to blend the colorants to obtain the target color, she would be clueless as the prior art references do not give her such information.

In contrast, the claimed invention requires that the blending ratio be presented to the user, and is, therefore, patentably distinguishable from the applied references.

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/879,958

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection is now believed appropriate and therefore respectfully requested.

All claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP



Randy A. Noranbrock for Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 42,940 Registration No. 37,093

USPTO Customer No. 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 17, 2005
KMB/KL/RAN/iyr